

only fair that those who have preceded us in this House should have credit for the utterances they have made and for their humble, though, up to the present, fruitless, endeavors to secure that legislation which I am now happy to say we are really about to secure for our Province. On 8th March, 1878, Mr. Bunster, who is well and no doubt favorably known to a good many members, took up the question, and moved a resolution to the effect that a clause should be inserted in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that no Chinese should be employed upon that work. I notice also, on referring to *Hansard*, that the ex-leader of the Government of that day (Mr. Mackenzie), and also Mr. Thompson and the present Sir Charles Tupper, spoke on that motion, and did not think the time had arrived, in consideration of the fact that no detriment should be placed in the way of the contractors prosecuting the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when such a clause should be placed in the contract. I notice that one of the previous representatives of Victoria district (Mr. DeCosmos) did not speak on that occasion. The resolution of Mr. Bunster was in these terms:

"That the Government insert a clause in each and every contract let for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that no man wearing his hair longer than 5½ inches shall be eligible for employment on said work, under a penalty varying from \$100 to \$1,000, or imprisonment for three and twelve months respectively, &c., &c."

Later, on 24th February, 1879, Mr. DeCosmos enquired if the "Act (passed by the Local Legislature) to provide for the better collection of Provincial taxes from Chinese," last Session, would be disallowed or not, and was informed by the Ministry of the day that said Act and other Acts of the Legislature of British Columbia were then under the consideration of the Government; and further, that the Act to which the enquiry had reference had been declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court of British Columbia, or one of the judges thereof, and that said decision had not been appealed from. On 16th April, 1879, Mr. DeCosmos moved that the petition of N. S. and some 1,500 others, respecting Chinese labor, be considered in Committee of the Whole, but with a view to arriving at a more practical conclusion than could possibly be attained in committee, he asked the House to allow him to substitute for said resolution (of which notice had been given) the following resolution, and by that means refer the matter to a special committee: That the petition from N. S. and others of the Province of British Columbia, praying for the passing of an Act to restrict further immigration of Chinamen; also, that in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway the employment of Chinese labor may be prohibited; and that the Act of the Provincial Government of British Columbia, in placing the local rate upon the Chinese in the country, may be confirmed, be referred to a select committee, to report on the same and generally on Chinese labor and immigration as affecting the Dominion, with power to send for persons and papers; said committee to consist of Messrs. DeCosmos, Williams, Charlton, Bunster, Bannerman, Trow, Brooks, Thompson and Connell. The motion was agreed to. I beg to state, although I have sought for that report, I have been unable to find it, and I am not in a position to say whether any special report from the select committee was ever laid before the House. I am, however, credibly informed that a short report, tending in the direction in which we are now walking, was laid before the House and embodied in the Votes and Proceedings. On 24th March, 1880, Mr. DeCosmos moved that all petitions respecting Chinese, presented to this House during present Session, be printed in Votes and Proceedings, which was so amended as to read "be printed for use of members." If that has been done, I have also been unsuccessful in my research. I may say that I desire to place these facts and dates on record, as they are of the highest importance to

Mr. BAKER (Victoria).

our constituents and also to the people generally of British Columbia, who are so thoroughly absorbed at the present time on this Chinese question. On 21st April, 1880, Mr. DeCosmos again moved for select committee to be appointed, to whom should be referred all petitions presented to the House during the then present Session respecting Chinese immigration, who shall report on the same, and generally on Chinese labor and immigration, as affecting the Dominion; with power to send for persons and papers, and to report from time to time; said committee to consist of Messrs. DeCosmos, Williams, Charlton, Bannerman, Brooks, Trow, Ouimet, Thompson, Connell, McInnes, Schultz, five of whom are to form a quorum. The motion was agreed to. I have been very desirous to see this report of the select committee, but I have been unable to find it, and I therefore can only conclude that no report was presented to the House. On 17th February, 1881, Mr. Bunster moved for a return of the duties collected on rice and powder for the year, and he entered at some length into the Chinese question. The hon. gentleman at that time endeavored to show that the duty had been taken off rice and retained on gunpowder, thereby placing the miners of British Columbia at a considerable disadvantage, so far as the Chinese were concerned. On 14th March, 1881, Mr. Bunster objected to the Chinese being included in the Bill for the naturalisation of aliens. On 12th April, 1882, in Committee of Supply, under the head of immigration, some further slight references were made by Mr. Bunster to this important subject. On 12th May, 1882, Mr. DeCosmos again refers to Chinese immigration, and quotes the United States Bill of 1876-77, to which the Secretary of State has referred, and also to the enactments of Australia, whereby £10 per head is charged upon all Chinamen coming to the colony, and also a restrictive Act, making it impossible for more than one Chinaman for every 100 tons of the tonnage of a vessel to enter the colony. Again, on 13th May, 1882, Mr. Bunster refers to the subject on a question of privilege, and objects to the duty being taken off rice while that on powder remained. Now, in the Session of 1883, this matter, as everybody is doubtless aware, was brought up in this House; and again, in 1884, not only by myself and colleague, but by every member coming here from the Province of British Columbia, and we endeavored to show, and I think successfully, that it was important, not only to the Province of British Columbia, but to the Dominion at large, that some such legislation as we are now discussing should be enacted. Even as recently as 1884 the Legislature of British Columbia enacted a law upon this subject. The principal feature to which I shall refer was that embodied in the preamble of the measure, in which they assert, rightly or wrongly, that the Local Legislature has something to do with legislation of that nature. I find, in the proceedings of that Legislature, referring to this subject, they say:

"Instead of sustaining the action of the Provincial Government and Legislature and that of the members of British Columbia in the Federal Parliament on the subject of the prohibition of Chinese immigration, the Dominion Government appointed a commission, composed of the hon. Mr. Chapleau, Secretary of State for the Dominion, and the Hon. Mr. Justice Gray, of this Province, to enquire into and report upon the Chinese question. The enquiry did not seem to be so thorough as, if undertaken at all, the importance of the subject fairly demanded that it should have been. It is to be hoped, however, that hurried and imperfect as the enquiry in this Province was, sufficient information has been obtained by the commissioners to induce them to report to the Federal Government the urgent need of restrictive legislation being undertaken during the ensuing session of the Dominion Parliament. It will be for you to consider whether, in view of the Chinese Immigration Act passed last Session having been disallowed by the Dominion Government, it is advisable to repeat legislation on the subject during the present Session."

This appears in the speech of the Lieutenant Governor to the Legislature. Further on, during the Session of that Legislature, I find that they again took up the subject of Chinese immigration, notwithstanding the fact that the